REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claim 48 to correct a typographical error. Claims 8-16, 31-35 and 39-51 remain pending in the application.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd ¶

The Examiner rejected claim 48 as being indefinite. The Examiner's assumption that claim 48 should depend from claim 47 is correct; the Applicants have corrected the typographical error.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 8-10, 15-16, 47, 48, and 51 as being anticipated by Wiberg, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,946). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

It is important to remember that anticipation requires that the disclosure of a single piece of prior art reveals **every** element, or limitation, of a claimed invention. Furthermore, the limitation that must be met by an anticipatory reference are those set forth in each statement of function in a claims limitation, and such a limitation cannot be met by an element in a reference that performs a different function, even though it may be part of a device embodying the same general overall concept. Wiberg fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 8-10, 15-16, 47, 48, and 51 and, therefore, those claims are not anticipated thereby.

Claim 8 recites:

> 8.   A method of operating a node of a telecommunications network which prepares network system information for transmission across an air interface to a user equipment unit, the system information including a system information block type which is included in protocol blocks, the protocol blocks being a system information block and a referencing block, the referencing block being one or both of a master information block and a scheduling block, the protocol blocks in which the system information is included having a system information block type field which includes a system information block type value which corresponds

to the system information block type, the system information block comprising one or more segments, comprising the steps of:

including a first **system information block type extension indicator** in the system information block type field of the referencing block **when the system information block type for a system information block referenced by the referencing block does not have a system information block type value in a nominal range of system information block type values**;

including a first **system information block type extension field** in the referencing block;

including in the first system information block type extension field a system information block type extension value which indicates a system information block type for the system information block referenced by the referencing block; and

including a second system information block type extension indicator in the system information block type field of a segment of the system information block referenced by the referencing block. (emphasis added)

The Applicants' claimed invention is directed to overcoming a limitation in the types of system information blocks (SIBs) available according to Technical Specification 3GPP TS 25.331. To overcome the limited types of SIBs according to TS 25.331, the claimed invention introduces the use of an SIB "type extension indicator" and a "type extension field." Although the teachings of Wiberg do relate, in part, to the use of SIBs, there is no teaching therein to include a SIB **"type extension indicator"** in a SIB type field "when the system information block type for a system information block referenced by the referencing block does not have a system information block type value in a nominal range of system information block type values." Furthermore, there is no teaching in Wiberg to include an SIB **"type extension field"** in a referencing block and including in such SIB type extension field a "system information block type extension value which indicates a system information block type for the system information block referenced by the referencing block." The novel combination of features can be used in a system information message to indicate the type of the conveyed SIB when the type of the SIB is not one of the original SIB types defined in the early versions of TS 25.331. Whereas Wiberg fails to teach the use of an SIB "type extension indicator" or an SIB "type extension field," it fails to anticipate claim 8.

Whereas independent claims 15, 47 and 51 recite limitations analogous to those of claim 8, they are also not anticipated by Wiberg. Furthermore, whereas claims 9 and 10 are dependent from claim 8, claim 16 is dependent from claim 15, and claim 48 is dependent from claim 47, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also not anticipated by Wiberg.

4.)   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 11-14, and 45 as being unpatentable over Wiberg in view of Numminen, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0120265); and claims 31-35, 39-46 and 50 as being unpatentable over Wiberg in view of TS 25.331 (3GPP TS 25.331 v5.5.0 Release 5). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

As established *supra*, Wiberg fails to teach the use of an SIB "type extension indicator" or an SIB "type extension field" as recited in independent claims 8, 15 and 47. The Examiner does not point to any teaching in Numminen of such elements and, therefore, claims 11-14 and 45, which are dependent from claims 8 and 15, respectively, and include the limitations thereof, are not obvious over Wiberg in view of Numminen. Similarly, the Examiner does not point to any teaching in TS 25.331 of such elements, and, therefore, claims 31-35, 39-46 and 50, which are dependent from claims 8, 15 and 47, respectively, and include the limitations thereof, are not obvious over Wiberg in view of TS 25.331.

* * *

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 8-16, 31-35 and 39-51.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roger S. Burleigh,Reg#40542/

Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: May 19, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com